



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FASTIGIUM.

IN PLINY, N. H. XXXV. 152.

Mr. Carleton L. Brownson in his article on archaic pediment reliefs from the Akropolis (p. 28, ff. above) quotes Pliny, N. H. xxxv. (12, 45,) 152, in support of his theory of the evolution of pediment sculpture. Although Mr. Brownson quotes the passage (p. 34) it may be as well to repeat it here: "Butadis inventum est rubricam addere aut ex rubra creta fingere, primusque personas tegularum extremis imbricibus inposuit, quæ inter initia prostypa vocavit, postea idem ectypa fecit. hinc et fastigia templorum orta." Mr. Brownson remarks: "*Fastigia* may from the whole connection and the Latin mean 'pediments.' Here then we have stated approximately the conclusion which seems at least probable on other grounds, namely, that the tympanum of the pediment was originally filled with a group in terracotta, beyond doubt painted and in bas-relief." Although Pliny's words are not of vital importance to Mr. Brownson's argument, they seem to deserve a brief discussion quite irrespective of the application made of them.

So far as there is any doubt as to the meaning of this passage, it lies in the words *prostypa*, *ectypa*, and *fastigia*. I am unable to find any passage in which *prostypa* and *ectypa* are set side by side in such a way as to show just how they differ. The difference usually assumed is that assumed by Mr. Brownson, namely, that between low relief and high relief. I would suggest the possibility that *prostypa* may be (high or low) reliefs of the ordinary kind with a background, while *ectypa* may perhaps be reliefs without background, if such an expression is admissible—such works, for instance, as the well-known terracottas in the British Museum representing Perseus and Bellerophon.¹ Such reliefs *à jour* might

¹ MILLINGEN, *Anc. uned. Mon.* ii., pl. 2, 3; MÜLLER-WIESELER, *Denkmäler*, I. xiv. 51, 52. Discussed in the *Am. Jour. of Arch.* iii. (1887), p. 33 f. See also OVERBECK, *Plastik*, 3d Ed., i. p. 161 ff.

properly be called *ἔκρυπα*; there is, however, so far as I know, too little evidence available to make further discussion of any value.

With *fastigia* the case is different. The word *fastigium* is by no means rare, and its general meaning of roof, or more properly gable, is well known, but Mr. Brownson wishes to render it *pediment group*, which is rather different. It is, of course, absurd to suppose that the invention of terracotta reliefs is regarded by Pliny as the cause of triangular gables or of sloping roofs; that is, of *fastigia* in the ordinary signification of the word. The reference must obviously be to some part of the adornment of the sloping roof or gable, that is, to the cornices, the pediment groups, or the acroteria. We may therefore leave out of account all passages in which *fastigium* is used to designate a slope² or merely the top of a building.³ The exact meaning of the word, and the possible applications of it to architectural members or ornaments not covered by the exact meaning, can be learned only by an examination of those passages in which the word is used in an architectural sense. Most of these passages are in Vitruvius.⁴

Vitruvius (iii. 4, 12, p. 81), says: "tympani autem quod est in fastigio altitudo sic est facienda uti frons coronæ ab extremis cymatiis tota dimetiatur in partes novem et ex eis una pars in medio cacumine tympani constituatur, dum contra epistylia columnarumque hypotrachelia ad perpendicularum respondeat. coronæque supra æqualiter imis præter simas sunt conlocandæ. insuper coronas simæ, quas Græci *ἐπαιετίδας* dicunt, faciendæ sunt, altiores octava parte co-

² *E. g.*, VITRUV., viii. 6 (5), 3; 7 (6), 6; v. 9, 7.

³ *E. g.*, SUTTON., *Aug.* 94. OVID., *Met.* i. 373 f. Many other examples might be mentioned to no purpose. OVID., *Met.* xv. 670 ff. "In serpente deus prænuntia sibila misit, | adventuque suo signumque arasque foresque | marmoreumque solum fastigiaque aurea movit" is not to be taken literally. The *fastigia aurea* is the top of the temple, opposed to *marmoreum solum*.

⁴ I give a list of the passages in which Vitruvius uses *fastigium*, but shall discuss only those that seem to me of importance. The pages cited are those of the edition of Rose and Müller-Strübing: ii. 1, 3, p. 34; iii. 1, 2, p. 69; iii. 2, 5, p. 71; iii. 4, 12, pp. 81, 82; iv. 2, 2, p. 88; iv. 2, 5, p. 90; iv. 3, 6, p. 93; iv. 7, 5, p. 100; v. 1, 10, p. 107; v. 8, 1, p. 119; v. 9, 7, p. 124; vii. 1, 3, p. 163; vii. 1, 6, p. 164; vii. 1, 7, p. 165; vii. 5, 2, p. 172; vii., 5, 3, p. 173; vii. 5, 5, p. 174; vii. 5, 6, p. 174; viii. 6, 3, p. 206; viii. 7, 3, p. 207; viii. 7, 6, p. 209; x. 19, 6, p. 274.

ronarum altitudinis, acroteria angularia tam alta quantum est tympanum medium, mediana altiora octava parte quam angularia. 13. Membra omnia quæ supra capitula columnarum sunt futura, id est, epistylia zophoræ coronæ tympana fastigia acroteria inclinanda sunt," etc. "The height of the tympanum which is in the *fastigium* should be so made that," etc. "The corner acroteria [should be made] as high as is the middle of the tympanum, the middle ones higher by one-eighth than the corner ones. All the members above the capitals of the columns, *i. e.*, epistyles, friezes, cornices, tympana, *fastigia*, and acroteria, should be inclined," etc. Here the tympanum is spoken of as in the *fastigium*. The *fastigium* must then be regarded either as the whole of which the tympanum forms a part, or as something in which the tympanum is contained, or by which it is surrounded, that is to say, either as the whole gable or as the projecting lines (cornices) by which the tympanum is defined and shut in. But at the end of the passage, epistyles, friezes, cornices, tympana, *fastigia*, and acroteria are mentioned as the members above the capitals of the columns, and the order in which they are mentioned shows that they are counted from the columns upward. The *fastigia* here come between the tympana and the acroteria. Here, then, *fastigium* can be nothing else than the projecting front of the roof, *i. e.*, the oblique cornices. As this meaning is one of the two possibilities in the beginning of the passage, we may safely assume that in the whole of this passage *fastigium* denotes the oblique cornices.

The same result is obtained from two other passages. The first is iv. 2, 2, p. 88: "ideo quod antiqui fabri quodam loco ædificantes, cum ita ab interioribus parietibus ad extremas partes tigna prominentia habuissent conlocata, inter tigna struxerunt supraque coronas et fastigia venustiore specie fabrilibus operibus ornaverunt"——"they adorned the cornices and *fastigia* with artificers' works." That the cornices (coronæ) and *fastigia* are thus spoken of in one breath as being adorned in the same way shows that they must be similar one to the other. The second passage is iv. 2, 5, p. 90, "etiamque antiqui non probaverunt neque instituerunt in fastigiis mutulos aut denticulos fieri sed puras coronas, ideo

quod nec cantherii nec asseres contra fastigiorum frontes distribuuntur nec possunt prominere, sed ad stillicidia proclinati conlocantur." "The ancients did not sanction or teach that mutules or dentils be made in the *fastigia*, but plain cornices, because neither the rafters nor the laths are arranged transversely to the fronts of the *fastigia*, and cannot project, but are placed sloping for the sake of the rain." This can apply only to the oblique cornices, for the horizontal cornice⁵ frequently has dentils. Indeed, the rule laid down by the "ancients" of Vitruvius was not carefully observed, as dentils under the oblique cornices also occur (*e. g.*, in the temple at Priene).

Vitruvius says in iv. 7, 5, p. 100, "supra trabes et supra parietes traiecuræ mutulorum parte IIII altitudinis columnæ proiciantur, item in eorum frontibus antepagmenta figantur, supraque ea tympanum fastigii structum seu de materia conlocetur, supraque id fastigium columnen cantherii templa ita sunt conlocanda," *etc.* Here the "tympanum fastigii" is equivalent to "tympanum quod est in fastigio" above, and the last words are to be rendered "and above that the *fastigium*, the peak, the rafters, and the purlins should be so placed," *etc.*, the word *id* after *supra* not being in agreement with *fastigium*, but referring back to *tympanum*.

When Vitruvius uses the word *fastigium* in a technical sense, and uses it accurately, he means the oblique cornice (including the *sima*) of a pediment. In its more general sense the word means, as everyone knows, gable, roof, and top. From which of these uses does Pliny's expression, "*hinc et*

⁵ Incidentally these passages show how Vitruvius uses the word *corona*. In iii. 4, 12, "*frons coronæ*" is evidently the horizontal cornice, below in "*coronæque supra æqualitur imis præter simas*," "*insuper coronas simæ. . . altiores octava parte coronarum altitudinis*," the oblique cornice exclusive of the *sima* is evidently referred to by *corona*, while in 13, "*zophoræ coronæ tympana fastigia*," the *coronæ* are again the horizontal cornices. So in iv. 2, 2, the *coronæ* appear to be the horizontal cornices, while in iv. 2, 5, the *puræ coronæ* are distinctly said to be *in fastigiis*. In iv. 3, 6, p. 93, "*reliqua omnia (i. e., all above the metopes of a Doric temple), tympana simæ coronæ, quemadmodum supra scriptum est in ionicis ita perficiantur*," the *fastigia* are not mentioned at all, probably because *simæ* and *coronæ* are mentioned, and *simæ* + *coronæ* = *fastigia*. It seems that *corona* denotes a cornice without *sima*. The horizontal cornice has no *sima*, and thus is called *corona*, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the term *corona* being applied to the oblique cornices only when the *sima* is to be expressly or by implication excluded.

fastigia templorum orta," derive its meaning? Pliny has just been describing the beginnings of terracotta relief work. Let us see what terracottas are known which can be connected with *fastigia* in any sense. Beginning with those mentioned by ancient writers we find that Vitruvius, in describing a class of temples called *barycephalæ*, says (iii. 2, 5, p. 71), "ornanturque signis fictilibus aut æreis inauratis earum fastigia tuscanico more, uti est ad Circum Maximum Cereris et Herculis Pompeiani, item Capitolii," "and their *fastigia* are adorned with figures of terracotta or gilded bronze in the Tuscan fashion as is that near the Circus Maximus of Ceres and of Hercules at Pompeii, likewise of the Capitolium." Pliny, N. H. xxxv. 12, 157, "fictilis in fastigio templi eius (*sc.*, Iovis) quadrigas," and xxviii. 2, 16, "cum in fastigium eiusdem delubri præparatæ quadrigæ fictiles in fornace crevissent," refers to the adornment of the Capitolium in Tarquin's time. Livy (xxix. 38) tells us that the terracotta quadriga was afterward replaced by a quadriga of gilt bronze, to which Vitruvius doubtless refers. This chariot stood, not in the pediment, but on the top of the gable, the central acroterium of the temple.⁶ Statues *in fastigio* may, then, be acroteria, not pediment statues. So when Pliny (xxxvi. 5, 13) says, in speaking of Bupalos and Athenis, "Romæ eorum signa sunt in Palatina æde Apollinis in fastigio et omnibus fere quas fecit divos Augustus," he can hardly intend to say that there were enough pediment groups of just the right size by Bupalos and Athenis to furnish "nearly all" the temples built by Augustus. Acroteria are not necessarily so accurately fitted to the size of the building they adorn.

Pliny (xxxv. 12, 158) says "[fictilia] fastigia quidem templorum etiam in urbe crebra et municipiis, mira cælatura et arte sui que firmitate sanctiora auro, certe innocentiora," and again (xxxvi. 2, 6) "tacuere tantas molis in privatam domum trahi præter fictilia deorum fastigia." What are these "fictilia *fastigia*"? We have seen that statues *in fastigio* are acroteria according to Pliny's usage. Can the word *fastigium* alone be used to denote a figure standing above the

⁶ This is plainly to be seen in the prototype of the relief from the arch of Marcus Aurelius, BRUNN, *Denkmäler*, No. 269, cf. also LANCIANI, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, p. 90. The upper part of Lanciani's plate is indistinct.

pediment? I know of but one instance of a translation of *fastigium* into Greek, and in that instance it is rendered by ἀκρωτήριον. Suetonius (*Div. Jul.* 81) says, "Calpurnia uxor imaginata est conlabi fastigium domus maritumque in gremio suo confodi." Plutarch (*Cæs.* 63 [738]) tells that Cæsar awoke and found Calpurnia talking in her sleep, apparently dreaming that she held him murdered in her arms. "οἱ δὲ οὐ φασὶ τῇ γυναικὶ ταύτην γενέσθαι τὴν ὄψιν· ἀλλὰ ἦν γάρ τι τῇ Καίσαρος οἰκίᾳ προσκείμενον οἶον ἐπὶ κέσμῳ καὶ σεμνότητι τῆς βουλῆς ψηφισαμένης ἀκρωτήριον, ὥς Αἰβίος ἱστορεῖ, τοῦτο ὄναρ ἢ Καλπουρνία θασαμένη καταρρηγνύμενον ἔδοξε ποτνιάσθαι καὶ δακρύειν."*) It may be that ἀκρωτήριον is improperly used by Plutarch, but that is hardly probable. It is far more likely that ἀκρωτήριον here denotes the free standing figure on the top of the roof and that *fastigium* in Suetonius is equivalent to *signum in fastigio* in some of the passages of Pliny. When Livy (xl. 2) says "[atrox tempestas] fastigia aliquot templorum a culminibus abrupta fœde dissipavit," it is hardly possible that the *fastigia* should be anything else than figures standing exposed to all the fury of the wind. Such figures standing *in culminibus* are none other than acroteria. When the word *fastigium* is applied to sculpture it designates, then, not pediment-groups but acroteria.

In recent years many terracotta fragments have been found, notably at Selinous and Olympia, which served as sheathings for cornices and the like.⁸ It is possible that Pliny's words, "hinc et fastigia templorum orta," may refer to such terracottas, the word *fastigium* being then used in the strict architectural sense of Vitruvius. This is, however, improbable, for Pliny has been discussing reliefs which, being at the ends of the roof tiles, projected above the edge of the roof. Now the terracotta sheathings are, as a rule, not

* There can be no doubt that Plutarch uses ἀκρωτήριον as a translation of *fastigium*. Cic., *Philippic.* ii. 43, 110, says, "quem is (sc., Cæsar) maiorem honorem consecutus erat quam ut haberet pulvinar, simulacrum, fastigium, flaminem?" Cf. FLORUS, ii. 13, 91, "omnes unum in principem congesti honores: circa templa imagines . . . fastigium in domo," etc.

⁸ DÖRPFELD, GRAEBER, BORRMANN, and SIEBOLD, *Einundvierzigstes Winckelmanns program*, Berlin, 1881, cf. BÖTTICHER, *Olympia*, p. 196 ff. See Mr. Brownson's remarks, p. 30 f.

reliefs, and do not project above the roof. They cannot in any way be regarded as a development from the reliefs of Butades. On the other hand, acroteria stand to the front of a temple in a somewhat similar relation to that occupied by the reliefs of Butades to the side. They might, at any rate, be regarded as a development from those reliefs. It would seem, therefore, that Pliny refers, in the words cited, to acroteria.⁹

My conclusion, if correct, does not go far to invalidate Mr. Brownson's general results, for the passage from Pliny was far from being one of his main arguments. I cannot, however, refrain from suggesting that if terracotta pediment-reliefs were ever in vogue, it seems strange that no recognizable fragments of them have survived; for terracotta, though fragile, is exceptionally durable, and is not exposed to the dangers of the lime-kiln, the smelting-pot, or the forge, as are other materials employed for sculpture and the like. But my purpose is not to attack Mr. Brownson's conclusions, but to explain Pliny's use of *fastigium*.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

AUSTIN, TEXAS,
May, 1893.

⁹ CICERO *de Orat.* iii. 46, 180. "Capitolii fastigium illud, et ceterarum ædium, non venustas sed necessitas ipsa fabricata est. Nam cum esset habitatio, quemadmodum ex utraque tecti parte aqua delaberetur, utilitatem templi fastigii dignitas consecuta est; ut etiamsi in cælo statueretur, ubi imber esse non posset, nullam sine fastigio dignitatem habiturum esse videatur" refers not to the pediment sculptures especially, but to the entire gable with all its wealth of color and gilding. At the same time the slope of the roof is prominent in his mind.